

NEVADA MENTAL HEALTH AND DEVELOPMENT SERVICES
Substance Abuse Prevention and Treatment Agency (SAPTA)
Objective Review Panel
August 30, 2007 – 9:00 a.m.
Nevada State Library and Archives, Room A
100 N. Stewart Street, Carson City, Nevada

Present: Cheryl Townsend (Clark County DJJS), Joseph Haas (Washoe County Department of Juvenile Services), Dr. Stuart Ghertner (Southern Nevada Adult Mental Health), Patricia Stilen (Mid-American Addiction Technology Transfer Center), Ray Kendall (Rural Clinics)

Staff: Maria D. Canfield, Greg Weyland, Roger Volker, Sara Baiza, Kirk Hawkins, Layne Wilhelm, Barbara Caskey

Also present: Samra Dayani (Solutions Recovery Inc.), Jennifer Norland (CASAT), Jackson Buck (to take Minutes)

I. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

Ms. Canfield called the meeting to order at 9:10 a.m. She reviewed locations where meeting notices were posted and attendee introductions were heard. Ms. Canfield thanked individuals for their attendance.

II. REVIEW, DISCUSS AND MAKE FUNDING RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE ADMINISTRATOR OF MENTAL HEALTH AND DEVELOPMENTAL SERVICES DIVISION, FOR THE CO-OCCURRING MENTAL HEALTH AND SUBSTANCE ABUSE TREATMENT SERVICES REQUEST FOR APPLICATIONS

Ms. Canfield reported the Mental Health and Developmental Services Division received State general funding during the Legislative session and that some of the funding was for co-occurring pilot projects. The first one is the RFA for services in Las Vegas. This meeting will discuss selecting one provider to provide services to both adults and adolescents or two providers. Services will continue through the next year. Future services will be added for Northern and Rural Nevada and another meeting to discuss those applications may be held in February or March 2008.

Mr. Volker asked for attendance cooperation when addressing issues to expedite the meeting. He reviewed meeting procedure and stated a summary of the applications will be given with discussion to follow regarding recommendations on how pilot projects should be initiated.

Ms. Stilen asked if a COSIC grant was applied for. It was clarified a grant was not applied for.

1. Bridge Counseling and Associates

Requested Amount \$124,245

Mr. Wilhelm read from the Treatment and Fiscal Technical Review Summary for Bridge Counseling and Associates. They were established as Operation Bridge in 1971 to provide substance abuse and mental health counseling and are currently certified to provide

comprehensive evaluations and outpatient treatment for adults and adolescents. Services are available in Spanish and English with over 35 dually-credentialed staff. The program is located in Las Vegas and proposes to treat 38 to clients in the outpatient setting. The request was for \$124,245. Application strengths and weaknesses from the Treatment and Fiscal Technical Review Summary were reviewed.

Ms. Townsend noted there was a diverse representation of the Board under Staffing and stated that, in her opinion, it did not identify the Board's role.

Mr. Haas reported there was no listing of who would provide the direct service and their credentials under staffing. The family therapy could have been more detailed to provide how families would be engaged. The collaborative process could have been more detailed. He also questioned the use of evidence-based practices.

Ms. Townsend agreed that good evidence-based, clinical practice was presented, but not evidence-based models.

Ms. Stilen explained how there was a lack of awareness for primary abuse.

Mr. Kendall expressed concern with the administrative staff and how therapy would be put into practice, but, in his opinion, it was one of the better applications.

Ms. Townsend felt the past practice was different from what was reflected in the application.

Dr. Ghertner questioned what this program will do differently from other programs and how it will be implemented.

Ms. Townsend stated a strength of the application was the number of dually-licensed staff members. Mr. Harris agreed and commended the language used in the application.

Ms. Stilen noted the issue of mental health diagnosis was not addressed in the application, but their strength was with family services and a learning approach which was adapted from NIATAC.

2. Board of Regents Nevada System of Higher Education

Requested Amount \$109,988

Ms. Caskey read from the Treatment and Fiscal Technical Review Summary for Board of Regents Nevada System of Higher Education. They promote excellence in counselor training and counseling research through course work and supervised clinical practices in a variety of specialties including community mental health counseling, addictions counseling, school counseling, and rehabilitation counseling. Students who complete the counseling programs are eligible for licensure in the State of Nevada. Department of Counselor Education faculty have extensive clinical, as well as research experience with co-occurring mental health and substance abuse treatment programs. They have also published numerous research articles on these subjects. The faculty had been awarded state and federal grants on addiction treatment and has successfully managed a variety of programs funded by SAPTA, NIMH, and UNLV. The program is located in Las Vegas and proposes to treat 160 adults at the University of Las Vegas campus in an outpatient setting in ten-week blocks. There were no specific sites required to treat adults listed in

the RFA. The request was for \$109,988. Ms. Caskey reviewed application strengths and weaknesses from the Treatment and Fiscal Technical Review summary.

Dr. Ghertner commented that the request seemed more for training-funding, than offering services. Mr. Kendall agreed with that comment.

Ms. Stilen stated that, in her opinion, the plans were not realistic and that principles do not seem to be integrated. The 10-week blocks were inconsistent with evidence-based practice.

Mr. Haas explained how the faculty should be available on-site to deal with emergencies if the program is funded.

Ms. Townsend stated a strength was the description of treatment processes, but that she didn't find ample staffing.

Dr. Ghertner requested clarification that students will be providing the services under supervision and questioned the location of the facility and stated the goal was to capture clients where treatment was already available.

Mr. Kendall commented that the senior therapist should be licensed and that, in his opinion, the salary for the directors was excessive. Mr. Haas stated the amount would be justified if the directors were providing the service with the students in an insular position.

Ms. Stilen questioned the use of graduate students.

Ms. Townsend stressed the importance of developing and enhancing skills.

Mr. Haas reported he rated the application presentation high, but that it should address the issue of direct service.

Mr. Kendall stated the program would be stronger if it was integrated into an existing program.

3. Community Counseling Center, Las Vegas

Requested Amount \$121,110

Mr. Wilhelm read from the Treatment and Fiscal Technical Review Summary for Community Counseling Center in Las Vegas. They are dedicated to education, prevention, treatment and advocacy to promote the healthy functioning of individuals, families and society. They are committed to providing culturally competent, affordable, and linguistically appropriate mental health care in a manner that is both compassionate and professional. They are accredited by the Substance Abuse, Prevention, and Treatment Agency at a level 3, the highest rating for a public-funded agency. They maintain a strong working relationship with UNLV providing training and supervision for students. The program is located in Clark County, Nevada and is proposed to treat 250 adults annually or 180 clients for a nine-month period in an out-patient setting in Henderson, Nevada. The request was for \$121,110. Application strengths and weaknesses from the Treatment and Fiscal Technical Review Summary were reviewed by Mr. Wilhelm.

Ms. Stilen commended the knowledge of the Quadrant Four population and the intention to hire more dually-credentialed staff, but a weakness was the budget.

Dr. Ghertner questioned co-occurring statistics.

Mr. Kendall stated he was impressed with the Board of Directors, but expressed concern that more staff or funding was not requested.

Ms. Townsend stated the role of the clinical supervisor and the Board was not provided. They did not adequately address family participation. A strength was that a quality manager was hired, but there was no listing of their expertise.

Mr. Kendall liked how the financial information was presented.

Mr. Haas stated it was one of the strongest adult program applications because they portrayed themselves as an experienced organization that were making an effort to treat the Quadrant Four population, but, in his opinion, the process was not reflected. The department may need to provide some guidance on how to fully implement some of the programs.

Dr. Ghertner agreed it was one of the stronger proposals, in general.

Ms. Stilen asked for a description of how the program would be implemented and for a description of their case management model. She stated, with this particular population, it takes more of a hands-on, in the field-type approach to case management. A comment was made stating that it may be the concierge model that will be implemented.

A comment was made regarding implementing the training by the manual.

At 10:16 a.m. the committee took a break. They reconvened at 10:35 a.m.

4. The Solutions Foundation

Requested Amount \$558,030

Ms. Caskey read from the Treatment and Fiscal Technical Review Summary for Solutions Foundations. They are a non-profit corporation created to assist the residents of Nevada by combating the prevalence of substance abuse within the State. Their main function is to provide education and awareness campaigns regarding addictive behavior, prevention methods, and impact of substance abuse in respect to economic, physical, and social consequences. They will assist individuals in obtaining treatment for substance abuse through individual counseling, group counseling, family counseling, and residential treatment. They believe uninsured, as well as at-risk populations, should receive appropriate treatment through the assistance of government-sponsored programming in conjunction with private funding. At the time the proposal was received by the Solutions Foundation, the organization had not acquired a 501(3)c. They propose to treat fifteen adult clients in an intensive, out-patient setting and the request was for \$558,030. The program is located in Las Vegas. Application strengths and weaknesses from the Treatment and Fiscal Technical Review Summary were reviewed by Ms. Caskey.

Mr. Kendall stated he was confused about the relationship between the Solutions Foundation organization and the Solutions Recovery organization and expressed concern about not having a viable summary.

Ms. Townsend expressed concern with the high-budget amount as it relates to the number of clients.

Ms. Stilen expressed concern about monitoring medications and questioned how that would be implemented and how family involvement on the weekends would be implemented.

Dr. Ghertner stated that, in his opinion, it was a private sector model superimposed on a public sector delivery request of which they have no experience.

Mr. Haas stated he had strong concerns with case management.

Mr. Kendall had concerns with the amount of administrative staff versus direct service.

Dr. Ghertner liked that the program offered drug testing.

A comment was made stating the organization needs to do some more work on their sliding fee scale.

5. West Care Nevada Inc.

Requested Amount \$180,777

Mr. Wilhelm read from the Treatment and Fiscal Technical Review Summary for West Care Nevada Inc. They are a 501(3)c non-profit organization founded in 1973 to provide services to indigent or low-income households who would not have access to treatment services. They currently service Nye and Clark Counties in five separate facilities. In the fall, services will expand to Washoe County with the opening of the Community Triage Center. Their services include substance abuse and addiction, treatment of homeless and runaway shelters, access to medical care, mental health treatment including an integrated treatment for co-existing disorders in all residential programs, academic programming for adolescents and adults as well as vocational training and assistance to access other community-based service agencies. Their services are available to adults, adolescents, children and families. Their mission is to empower everyone with whom they come in contact with to engage in a process of healing, growth and change benefiting themselves, their families, co-workers, and communities. The program is located in Las Vegas and is proposed to treat fifty adolescent clients in an out-patient and intensive out-patient settings at the Duncan site. The request is for \$180, 777. Application strengths and weaknesses from the Treatment and Fiscal Technical Review Summary were reviewed by Mr. Wilhelm.

Ms. Townsend stated that, in her opinion, this application provided the best evidence-based models specific to the area, but expressed concern that experience was not specific for managing co-occurring disorders and that there was a lack of dually-licensed staff members. She also expressed concern with the lack of previous evaluation activity.

Mr. Haas commented that it was a strong application and should be a model for evidence-based cases. He also commended case management and their experience level.

Dr. Ghertner noted the referral process would not be a weakness because there would be no referrals.

Ms. Stilen rated the application as one of the strongest because it cited NIMH trials and seemed consistent with Quadrant Four treatment practices and had strong programs.

Mr. Kendall liked their concept, but expressed concern with university involvement in the hands-on application.

Ms. Townsend stated it was a very significant proposal with the model that was presented, but the staff or the budget proposed may not provide the sustainability for the model.

Ms. Stilen asked if medications will be provided by another organization. It was clarified medications will not come with the client unless provided by Clark County Family Services.

Mr. Haas stated the evidence-based proposed was largely for substance abuse treatment and encouraged the department to work with providers.

Ms. Townsend questioned request amounts and the limited understanding of the models.

Mr. Volker explained the creation of the pilot project and stated that one provider was needed for adults and one provider for adolescents. Mr. Volker asked for the committee to choose one provider for adults and one provider for adolescents. The West Care application was chose as the adolescent provider. The Community Counseling Center was chosen as the adult provider.

At 11:17 a.m., the Committee took a break to discuss their decisions. They reconvened at 11:34 a.m.

III. PUBLIC COMMENT AND DISCUSSION

A. Samra Dayani, Solutions Recovery Inc., stated they were a sister company of Solutions Foundation and that they were a residential, adult treatment facility that serves alcohol and chemical dependency. Their intent was to assist individuals in overcoming dependency issues while also dealing with the mental and psychological health issues that accompany those dependencies. She reported the RFA specifically states applicants can only belong to non-profit organizations, but she explained how for-profit corporations can provide the same level of care as non-profit corporations.

IV. ADJOURN

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 11:54 p.m.

Joseph Haas moved to adjourn the meeting. Ray Kendall seconded the Motion. Motion carried unanimously.